



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,952	04/27/2005	Takehiko Aneqawa	CU-4170 RJS	2190
26530 7590 11/25/2008 LADAS & PARRY LLP 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604				
EXAMINER				
PARK, JEONG S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/532,952

Applicant(s)

ANEGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

JEONG S. PARK

Art Unit

2454

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/27/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/27/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CS-100)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/23/2005

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 5, line 16, the phrase "the information processing device" should be corrected as –the information processing terminal— for clear understanding of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 13 and 14 are drawn toward a computer-readable medium comprising computer program. The computer-readable medium was not clearly defined in the specification as one of the statutory categories and, as such, fails to establish a statutory category of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0107771 A1) in view of Kojima et al. (hereinafter Kojima)(U.S. Patent No. 6,807,388 B1).

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Shibata teaches as follows:

an output information management system including an information storage medium for a user, an output device which outputs information onto media (MFP, 1 in fig 1, refers an image processing apparatus, see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0025]), and a server (PC 2 in figure 1, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026]) communicably connected to the output device through a communication network,

the output device (MFP 1 in figure 1 and 2) having a reading unit (input unit 106 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]-[0030]) which reads the unique information from the information storage medium and a unit (communication unit 107 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0035]) which transmits information to be outputted onto media to the server in association with the unique information read by the reading unit (the input unit receives user's personal ID, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0042] and the communication unit transmits image data with user ID to the PC, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0046], see, e.g., steps 101 and 111 in figure 4); and

the server (PC 2 in figure 3) having a database (storage unit 207 in figure 3, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0037]) for storing the information received from the output device in association with the unique information (the image data emended user ID (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0045] and step 109 in figure 4) received from MFP are automatically stored in the storage unit, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0049]).

Shibata does not teach the information storage medium having a memory on which unique information is stored.

Kojima teaches as follows:

the secrecy management circuit (68 in figure 1) reads the content of the IC card and stores the secrecy management level registered in the IC card such as the permit level, the group ID, and the individual ID together with the user ID (see, e.g., col. 17, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Shibata with Kojima to include IC card stored the individual user ID as taught by Kojima in order to automatically give different usage right for each user based on predetermined secrecy management level.

Regarding claim 2, Shibata teaches as follows:

a database (storage unit 108 in figure 2) in which output prohibited information which is prohibited to be outputted by the output device or output permitted information which is permitted to be outputted by the output device is registered (user information stored in the storage unit and the user IDs of the users permitted to implement printing of the image data are read from the user information, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0060]);

a matching unit which matches information received from the output device with the information registered in the database (matching the user information from MFP with a user inputs the printing commend in the PC, see, e.g., step 209 in figure 5 and page 3, paragraph [0053]); and

a matching unit which transmits alarm information to the output device or an information processing terminal for an administrator (displaying user ID error message, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0052]) or stops the output if the matching unit determines as the result of the matching that information matches the output prohibited information or does not match the output permitted information (by embedding printing prohibition information in place of the user's ID a printing operation by all users can be prohibited, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0054]).

Shibata does not teach a server database stored output prohibited or permitted information instead of the storage unit in the output device (MFP).

Kojima teaches the secrecy management information stored on the PC (1 in figure 1) to accommodate to the updating of the managed information, the limitation of allowing to display or to print for a person who accesses to the data in speedy (see, e.g., col. 16, lines 22-29).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shibata to include a server database storing the secrecy management information as taught by Kojima in order to manage multiple output devices together with one dedicated PC or server.

Regarding claim 3, Shibata teaches as follows:

a database (storage unit 108 in figure 2) in which output prohibited information which is prohibited to be outputted by the output device or output permitted information which is permitted to be outputted by the output device is registered (user information stored in the storage unit and the user IDs of the users permitted to implement printing

of the image data are read from the user information, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0060]); and

a matching unit which matches information received from the output device with the information registered in the database (matching the user information from MFP with a user inputs the printing command in the PC, see, e.g., step 209 in figure 5 and page 3, paragraph [0053]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the output device ID stored in the database when multiple output devices are managed by one server or PC.

Regarding claims 5 and 10, it would be obvious to separate the read unit from the output device as an information processing terminal as claimed. Therefore they are rejected with same reason as presented above per claim 1.

Regarding claims 6, 12 and 14, they are rejected with same reason as presented above per claims 2 and 5.

Regarding claim 7, Shibata teaches as follows:

an output information database in which the ID information received from the information processing terminal and output information in association with each other (user information stored in the storage unit and the user IDs of the users permitted to implement printing of the image data are read from the user information, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0060]); and

a unit which stores the ID information received from the information processing terminal in association with output information that does not match the output prohibited

information or output information that matches the output permitted information as the result of the matching by the matching unit (matching the user information from MFP with a user inputs the printing command in the PC, see, e.g., step 209 in figure 5 and page 3, paragraph [0053]).

Regarding claim 8, they are rejected with same reason as presented above per claims 1 and 2.

Regarding claims 11 and 13, they are rejected with same reason as presented above per claims 1 and 2.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

November 21, 2008

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2446